

Barrett appears to be more concerned with the user side of a user-server arrangement, whereas embodiments within current Application are more concerned with the server side of a visitor-server arrangement. // Q

Barrett includes a background description of back and forward icons of a conventional browser. Barrett teaches profiling a user and storing information related to that profile within storage 18 of the local node 16. See column 6 at lines 62-65 and column 7 at line 15 of Barrett. The local node 16 represents the user side of the user-server arrangement. One of the functions that Barrett teaches includes initiating a download of a web page before a user requests it. If the user selects some other web page, the downloading of the prior web page is aborted. See column 9 at lines 10-16 of Barrett. All the software needed to implement Barrett may be on the user's side. Barrett appears to be focused more on improving performance on the user's side without regard to consequences on the server side. This is readily apparent from the initiated download that may become aborted. Such an action may cause a server for a web site to perform unnecessary tasks. Such tasks may slow down the server or require additional servers so that other users are not adversely affected by the aborted, partial downloads if many users are using the software described in Barrett.

Part of the teachings of the current Application are directed towards caching a portion of the pre-customized displays on the server, so that it does not have to be regenerated as frequently. As an example from the current Application, the pre-customized displays may be related to different NFL teams. The pre-customized displays are generated and cached on the server side. The generating and caching can occur as little as one time for each NFL team (about 30 or so NFL teams). See page 5 at line 17 to page 6 at line 6 of the current Application. Compare this to the conventional technology, where the display may be regenerated each time the information is requested. The regeneration can be millions of times if a million users access that display. Unnecessary regeneration consumes significant computing power of the server and should be minimize where reasonably possible. The discussion within this and the preceding two paragraphs are not to be construed as limitations to the present invention, but merely to illustrate some of the concepts involved with the technologies. //

Turning to claim 1, at least one pre-customized display is generated for a first visitor and cached on the server computer. The data file of a second visitor is analyzed, and the second

visitor is associated with the at least one pre-customized display. The at least one pre-customized display is displayed to the second visitor without having to regenerate it. Clearly, server resources can be more efficiently implemented because unnecessary regeneration of a pre-customized display can be avoided. The method described in Barrett is more concerned with optimizing performance on the user side than the server side. Generation and regeneration of displays by a server are not a concern to Barrett. See column 9 at lines 10-16 of Barrett. Barrett does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation to achieve the method of claim 1.

Claim 11 is amended to clarify that the computer readable memory is of a web site server computer. Claim 17 is amended to clarify that the computer executable software code is on a web site server computer. Barrett does not teach, suggest, or provide motivation for the computer executable software code or computer executable software on a web site server computer as in claims 11 and 17. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 11 and 17 further clarify the description of the server computer and are not being made for prior art reasons. Claims 16 and 20 are not amended and are believed to be allowable.

The Office Action states that use of multiple servers to operating in parallel in order to store the user profile and prioritizing the categories in the visitor profile in order to analyze the visitor profile are known in the art or programming choices. The claims must be considered as a whole and not as elements or limitations separately or in isolation. Synergistic effects of the limitations are not considered in this manner. Further, references including either of the limitations referred to within the Office Action may include teachings that may prevent their proper combination with Barrett. Applicant traverses the assertion in the Office Action and respectfully requests the examiner cite a reference in support of his or her position. See M.P.E.P. § 2144.03

Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-7 and 9-20. Applicants request that formal drawings be held in abeyance until allowable subject matter is found. Contact me if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

1/12/2001
Date

George R Meyer
George R. Meyer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,284

100 Congress Avenue
Suite 1440
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (512) 457-7093
Facsimile: (512) 457-7070

Gray Cary\AU\4050822.1
2101905-991190